

**Travel Drafting Team Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 15 October 2008 14:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Travel Drafting Team teleconference on Wednesday, 15 October 2008, at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-travel-dt-15oct08.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#oct>

Participants present:

Olga Cavalli - NCA nominated by Zahid Jamil, seconded by Greg Ruth, elected as group leader.

Zahid Jamil - CBUC

Greg Ruth - ISPCPC nominated by Ken Stubbs as group leader, declined nomination.

Tim Ruiz - Registrar c

Cyril Chua - IPC

Ken Stubbs - Ry c

Edmon Chung - Ry c

Robin Gross - NCUC

Avri Doria - GNSO Chair - absent apologies Chuck Gomes - GNSO vice chair - absent apologies

Staff:

Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: The recording has started.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you very much (Benadetta). Can we just do a roll call? Olga Cavalli. Olga has been chosen as the leader of the group. She was nominated by Zahid Jamil. And she was seconded by Greg Ruth.

On the call we have Zahid Jamil, Greg Ruth, Tim Ruiz, Cyril Chua, Ken Stubbs and (Robin Gross). And myself as the staff support. Thank you all guests.

Olga Cavalli Thank you Glen. Thank you for being on the call. And one comment that I was going to make a few minutes ago is that when we worked on

the (Geo Regions) document, it was very helpful for me having in the group English native speakers as I am not one.

And that was really very helpful with the language and with picking the right words. My English is not bad, but as you know, my mother language is Spanish.

So I'm glad to have you all both in the group. And I'm sure that also Zahid, his English is great. I've seen his message yesterday. So, with this comment about languages, I would like to ask maybe Glen or maybe you, which is outcome expected from this group?

It's a document. That it will be presented to whom? To the council and then to the Board. Could you Glen please remind which is the outcome expected from us?

Glen Desaintgery: It is (unintelligible) proposal for consideration by the council for ICANN (subsidation) of (GNSO) travel expenses. So, in my understanding, it is a document that - a proposal that will be provided to council. Am I right for the (unintelligible) per Robin, Cyril, Tim who on the council is that you (Greg)? Is that your understanding?

Greg Ruth: Yes. Yes.

Ken Stubbs: I do have a request for clarification here. If I could please? This is Ken Stubbs. It was my understanding that the funds that were designated for travel subsidies were not necessarily designated to a specific - for exclusive specific use by a body such as the council.

But rather that what we're doing at this point and time is to develop a methodology for managing those funds. And I think that - there is a big difference there.

Because in the letter that Doug Brent or the email that Doug Brent sent out, more or less elaborating on this thing. He was quite clear to indicate for instance that it was ICANN-specific desire that the funds be used for support for, not necessarily for council members.

And I think it's extremely important that if we're going to be moving forward, we need to make it clear on what we're doing at this point and time. Changing the mandate that ICANN gave? Or are we developing a methodology for dealing with the use of these funds?

(Donnie): Can I come in? This is (Donnie). I'm not clear on this. Can I - I think your point, but we need to, basically be very careful about the language. And I'd like to ask Glen, does a mandate provided by the council, because we're drafting team on behalf of council. And our mandate will be coming from there. What is the resolution say?

Do we have to develop a policy? Is the word a policy? Or does it talk about a methodology? Because we have to stick to that, or else we might have to go back to council and have that amended.

Olga Cavalli: As far as I know it is a process that must be developed.

Ken Stubbs: Well a process implies methodology. It doesn't - it does not define or refer to policy. But rather if we're dealing with a process, then it would seem that it would be more concerned about a methodology for dealing with this.

And that's where I get confused. Because in the early emails, and I'm only trying to establish a tone. I'm not advocating one way or the other.

In the early emails, there were specific references made to the funds needed to be specifically allocated to a specific group of individuals, i.e. GNSO councilors.

And I don't really think that regardless of where we go with developing the methodology, I don't think we can change that approach. If we decide for instance that we're going to allocate the funds to constituencies, then the constituencies should not necessarily be bound to allocate those funds to councilors who represent the constituencies.

But the constituencies should be given the opportunity to use those funds in a manner that they feel will most best reflect their participation in policy development and so forth. I hope I'm making sense.

Greg Ruth: I think that's right Ken.

Olga Cavalli: Who was that?

Greg Ruth: This is Greg Ruth. I think that our task is to figure out for this fiscal year what - how to allocate these funds in a way that - that supports the on-going work with the GNSO.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Yes. I somehow agree with you. I remember the document about the (unintelligible) policy that was issued by ICANN. And it was on public common. And I think at the beginning of the year, the middle

of the year, I do agree with - I think it was Ken. That that won't - that will not change.

I wonder if we as a council after our work in this group, would perhaps send some outcome document or some concepts in relation with that final policy. I'm not sure if we did that before.

I think we had a conference call in - I think it was August or July or September. And, where we discussed how to - how to allocate or how to design this (unintelligible) to the councilors.

But I'm not sure if we ever made a comment to ICANN after this travel policy piece. Correct me if I'm wrong. Maybe this is the opportunity for one time is to have our own policy for distributing this in the council for allocating this fund.

And on the other side, perhaps we could have the chance to make some comments to ICANN after this new travel policy has been issued. Any comments?

Ken Stubbs: I know in the past over - yeah this is Ken Stubbs. I know in the past that there have been comments that were made after a policy like this was issued. Because I specifically remember that.

The only thing I do not know is whether or not those comments were - reflect personal positions taken by specific members of the council. Or whether or not those comments reflect positions by constituencies. Or whether the comments were actually those of the council as a body.

I - maybe (Tim) or someone else can refresh my memory. But I do know for instance there were comments made by selected council members about the fact that they felt they balance - the amount allocated wasn't equitable.

That they felt that they should be entitled to specific level of travel. You know, i.e. business class or so forth. But I think those were individual comments. But I'm not certain there.

Olga Cavalli: And I - I agree with you. The comment - there was a comment from different constituencies and personal comments. I don't remember a GNSO comment on that - on that document. But anyway, perhaps we could ask (Jacks) and (Abley) if they think this is a good or bad idea. Or maybe the whole (unintelligible).

We could keep that idea in mind about having some concept towards - or smaller document to reply somehow to this new troubled policy. And I propose to you now to focus more on having some idea about how to allocate this funds within the council.

This should be our first task to work on. Do we agree on this? Okay.

Zahid Jamil: This is (Zheid). I have a comment. You can ask other people. I'm in the queue.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes. Go ahead (Zheid).

Zahid Jamil: I would be - I've given some comments on the previous team. I think there's nothing that stops us from going further. For instance, (unintelligible) and other has said this. I mean even others said that the

possibility of actually having the apportionment to the constituencies.
Or, restructuring maybe the different houses.

I don't see any when I read this. And I could, you know, be mistaken.
But I don't see anything in the travel policy which I'm reading right now.
Or the travel policy procedure where this would not be necessarily
possible for us to allocate it.

That's why I want to sort of keep it open beyond just the fact that we
give it to just council members. That's just one of the possibilities. I just
want to keep open while we discuss this.

Secondly, I'm just trying to figure out. I think Glen you made the point
that (unintelligible) funds allocated for the use of the council. Are we
saying that this is not - or ascending the ICANN meetings as is
mentioned in the policy?

Or are we saying generally to be used by the council? Just wanted to
get a clarification on that. Thanks.

Ken Stubbs: Well that's a good question. The funds were - it may even require
clarification. But I can't find Doug's FAQ letter that he sent out on that.

It was not specifically for use of the council. By that I mean, and please
correct me if I'm wrong guys. There was a FAQ that Doug specifically
pointed out that the funds could be used - I'll give you as an example.

If you had - let's assume that we had a large working group going at
this point and time. And then we decided that we wanted to fund it - the
Chair of that large working group. You could do that.

Or if there's specific constituency may have wanted to put someone forward in - let's say, in lieu of a council representative. That was a decision that was taken. And I can give you an example.

Because I believe the business - the (Leger Tree) constituency is putting someone forward who is a registry operator who's never been to an ICANN meeting because of economics.

And (Carolyn Hoover) from (Dye Co-Op), so I think there was flexibility there. I think the biggest decision that needs to be made here is some sort of a methodology for dealing with this.

And I would put a couple of things on the table. And if I'm talking too fast for you, please let me know.

Olga Cavalli: No. That's okay.

Tim Ruiz: This is (Tim). Can I make a comment before we get into what you want to put on the table?

(Robin Gross): I'd like to get in the queue too.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (Tim) go ahead. And then it was (Robin)?

(Robin Gross): Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (Tim)?

Tim Ruiz: You know, when I see this is that whatever we come up with should be in line with purpose which ICANN provided these funds. And I've heard some different things mentioned. So I just wanted to put out how I see this.

But that the - the procedure, or their policy that was posted - that document. You know, it does specifically mention that it was funding for ICANN meetings.

Now, maybe they meant that to be broader than just the three meetings a year. But, the money is actually calculated using a formula based on those three meetings per year.

So I'm not so certain that it's all that clear that this money is to be used outside of those - outside of those three meetings. Now maybe that's true, but I would think - my opinion would need completely clarification on that if we're going to use it outside of that.

And then just, I wanted to make it - just add my opinion that based on what's said. That I think it's also pretty clear that the funding is not intended solely for council members.

I think it very explicitly says that it could be used for others. That the council or the GNSO feels, you know, or important to have that - those ICANN meetings for one reason or another.

So I just wanted to put that out there. And if there needs to be some clarification on what the money's used for, I think we - we should probably get that sooner than later.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Tim). (Robin)?

(Robin Gross): Yeah. My perspective is that - is on the table that we could decide to use this money just for councilors. It's possible that we could allocate it for other members as well.

But it is also possible that we consider that the best use of it on our judgment may be that we need to get councilors to council meetings. So that is on the table. We can decide that.

It sounds like we've got a couple people who don't want to go that route. But it is a possibility.

Speaking from my own constituency, I know our biggest hurdle is getting people to meetings. And whether or not we say we're going to allocate it to the constituencies and they decide who comes. Or we're just going to send the council members.

Either way, that money is going to NCUC's councilors. That's how we're going to allocate it. Getting those councilors to the meeting.

So, I just want to express that's the important piece for us. That's what we're concerned about. We want to get our councilors to the meetings.

I sympathize that there are other constituencies that have no problem what so ever getting their councilors to the meeting. And they may want to use their funds to bring other less fortunate people.

I don't have a problem with that. That sounds totally fair. But I think, for those of us who want to be able to use that money to bring our

councilors to the meeting, that's an option available to us. And we should be able to take it.

Ken Stubbs: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Ken Stubbs: This is Ken Stubbs. I support (Robin)'s position there. And I'm looking at Doug's letter. And what (Robin) said is consistent with what Doug Brent said.

And that was Item Number 4. Individuals who are not members of an (SO) council can be selected. But there's no - because the goal of this policy was to lower barriers to participation.

And if we decide that through the methodology for managing these funds involves providing a certain amount of funds to a specific constituency. Then that constituency should in my opinion be allowed to use it in any way that it feels is most beneficial for advancing that participation.

Conversely, I'll take it one step further. And that is that that constituency should be allowed to decide in my opinion when it - those funds should be spent on travel subsidies.

Let me give you an example, so you understand what I'm talking about. It is much easier in many cases for people to travel to certain geographical areas of the world and the cost burden is not as significant.

But, if the ICANN decides to put a meeting in a part of the world where the cost becomes prohibitive, the constituency may say we have a basket of funds available for travel subsidies. We're not going to use the entire basket on a meeting in Washington, DC.

Because we are having a meeting - the following meeting will be held at Madagascar. And the cost to get there is prohibitive. So we want to use - we want to accumulate those funds.

I just don't want us to get into a procedure that says that the constituency is obligated to use the funds for a specific meeting. If it's being used for an ICANN meeting, and the constituency wants to take the amount that's allocated to it.

My proposal would be that we allocate funds to - on the basis - now please understand one thing. And I'm going to just give you a kind of - I don't think this should be - I don't think there should be a bi-right allocation.

I mean, I'm on the record for that. And I think (Tim) has made comments along that line too. But let's assume that that position is not necessarily one that's going to prevail in this committee.

And I'm just saying that I don't want to be specific and say, well have \$54,000 to allocate for this meeting. Because ICANN has not necessarily provided it to us on a meeting-by-meeting basis. And I think that's something that would be easy to negotiate with ICANN.

Olga Cavalli: Let me - let me summarize somehow. You're saying that there should be no obligation to use the whole money assigned for a certain meeting for example by the constituency?

But then they should be able - that each constituency should be able to allocate its funds? In relation with the need? Related with the place of the meeting? So, who they want to send to the meeting? Is that what you're saying?

Ken Stubbs: Yeah. And I'll give you - I'll use as an example. I'm going to take an example. I'm going to use - let's say the non-commercial constituency. Okay.

Suppose that they were having a meeting in Europe. And let's suppose that the non-constituency council members - let's say two of them at the time, were located in Europe.

And that the cost to get to that meeting would be minimal. And yet there was a meeting and it was going to be held in the Far East. And that was going to involve a significant expenditure.

Maybe the non-commercial constituency would decide, you know, we don't want to use that money just for Europe this time. We'd rather save it up and use it for a meeting that's at a much further location. We can get better use out of it that way.

I think the constituency has a mandate if that's the case, that the funds must be used for travel support to ICANN meetings. How the constituency elects to use those funds in my opinion should be at the discretion of the constituency.

If my position regarding this can't prevail, I'd rather give the constituency - I'd rather give (Robin)'s group, you know, maybe they can find a better way of maximizing it. Why not?

You know, it's the idea is to lower the barriers to participation. And I think (Robin)'s constituency is in the best position to decide how to use those funds most effectively for their constituency.

Olga Cavalli: I mostly agree with all that you're saying. Any comments to this?

Zahid Jamil: This is (Zheid) in the queue for that?

Man: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (Zheid)? Anyone else in the queue? Okay (Zheid) go ahead.

Zahid Jamil: I think that - I completely agree with the comment just made. I think Ken's right. If this is what the situation is on the table, then I would completely agree with the two concepts.

And so the roll-over of funds. But if they decide not to use a constituency - to not use it after one specific event, then that includes sort of support travel for. They can actually take some of those funds or all of those funds and roll it over for the next event.

And I think that's something that I completely would support. And the second, that obviously they should be able to decide how and who they want to allocate those publicly own these two fund travels to the

ICANN meetings. And I just wanted to chime in and support for (unintelligible).

Ken Stubbs: And I have one other comment to make. Only because I'm a chartered accountant. And it's just ingrained in my blood.

And that is I think the constituency - I've seen situations in the past. And I'll use (Norbit Kline) as a classic example.

Where the constituency may be able to obtain travel at a significantly lower rate than the ICANN people can.

And I think the constituency should be capable of delegating the funding in a way that best accommodates the constituency.

I don't like some of the rules that ICANN had put on the (Cairo) meeting. And I, you know, why should they only accommodate full funding for instance?

You know, maybe they have a situation like (Christina), where all they really needed was just enough subsidy to cover the hotel. You know, who knows?

I think ICANN should not be looking of their shoulder. The one thing that ICANN has the right to demand, and the community has the right to demand is full transparency.

And I think any member who accepts travel subsidy accepts a specific obligation. And I do feel that even though the constituency would impose this obligation, that it's a public obligation.

I've seen situations before, and I won't mention names, but I will tell you that it was in fact a non-com appointed to the council in the past Olga. Where the appointee literally never participated. All they did was go to parties and hang out.

And I think it's extremely important that anyone who accepts funding is obligated to not only provide - it has to be transparent. They need to provide an accounting.

And I really believe that constituencies should have guidelines that require something from that person in the way of - some sort of output. You know, but, that's my own position there.

Olga Cavalli: Someone else want to comment?

Greg Ruth: This is (Greg). Can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure (Greg). Someone else? Go ahead.

Zahid Jamil: This is (Zheid). I'm in the queue. (Zheid) in the queue.

Olga Cavalli: Okay (Zheid). So we have (Greg), (Zheid). Someone else? Go ahead (Greg).

Greg Ruth: The policy - or procedure as written by Doug does specify that the allocation of funds must be a transparent process. All the names of the people who accept funding must be made public.

And they are to be held accountable by writing some kind of report at the end of their time. To explain why, you know, how it was useful to ICANN for them to attend, and what they did and so forth.

So I think this is all in line with - I agree with Ken. This is all in line with the proposed policy - what ICANN has proposed as their policy.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Greg). (Zheid)?

Zahid Jamil: I think that we - I've agreed with the concept that they should be transparent. I would definitely chime in with that.

I think that there should definitely be an obligation to participate. I am hesitant to say that it's - I understand what is meant by an obligation to the public and to the community at large. I can understand that.

But I think to say that write it down and sort of articulate it in that sense may be a little difficult. Because fundamentally is an obligation to constituency.

However, I completely take the point that the participants should be obligated to participate in the process - at the meetings. And that their names (unintelligible) process, whatever the constituency decides to use them for should be transparent.

Now, coming to the last point about output. I think it's a good idea. But I don't think that councilors would necessarily have the time. They're already very - the ones who actually participating using these funds.

You (unintelligible). We're talking about people who are sort of attending because they've chosen by the constituencies will necessarily have to give some feedback.

I think it's best to let the constituency decide what sort of an output they would want from that person. Because I know that, you know, (Philip) or (Mike), etc. They're already fairly - have their plates full with a lot of work.

For them to write a report for the sake of, you know, complying with this. Or anybody else in of the constituency, I think may be over-burdensome.

But yes, I think just like we're letting the funds be allocated to the constituency and letting them decide. Let them decide whether they want some sort of an output or not also.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Zheid). Anyone else would like to comment? I would like to make a comment.

(Robin Gross): Hi. This is (Robin).

Olga Cavalli: (Robin) go ahead.

(Robin Gross): Yeah. I really agree with that last statement. That we - we really want to leave - we want to leave the accountability and those sorts of mechanisms up to the constituency - to their internal mechanisms.

I think it's important that we make it clear that it - we have to have a transparent process. But I think each constituency may do something a little bit different from another constituency. And that's okay.

And maybe they're not going to require a report of their councilors. But maybe they would require a report from a first time participant who used the fund.

I think we need to leave some flexibility up to the constituencies to decide what the mechanism is for that.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Robin). From my experience, (unintelligible) in developing countries have been signers by different (unintelligible) or international organizations to participate in different meetings.

And in general, we have the obligation to make some things - an outcome or report or something else. Like say for the (ITU) and United Nations or even ICANN.

If you participate in a ICANN fellowship program, they - you have some obligations of being in the meeting, and making some report afterwards.

But I do agree with (Zheid) and (Robin), that if you belong to a constituency, then it's the constituency that must say, which is a role they're - how do you show that you are participating. And if you have to or you don't have to make a report.

Maybe it's only your comments to the constituency and your feedback in ask or not. I think the flexibility towards constituency - I think it's for me it's the best way to go.

Anyway, now come up one piece. We can have a constituency. So perhaps it could be good for the council. Maybe if the council thinks that we should make it kind of a report.

I am surprised since I have been appointed of a year ago until now. That I'm not in any obligation of giving this - this report or this feedback to - maybe to the non-com. Or maybe to the council. Or maybe to someone else.

I think it would be good for helping the non-com appointee in their work. Which is not easy when you start to work in a council like the GNSO.

Because at the beginning you're kind of lost. And also for the rest of the council to see how the non-com appointee is just functioning and working.

I spend a lot of time in - for the council. I really enjoy being in the council. But I'm not sure if anyone is counting that or knowing that, so.

Maybe this - it could be something to think about in-between the non-com appointees towards the council and towards ICANN.

Ken Stubbs: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Ken Stubbs: Can I comment on your statement there?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Who's this? This is Ken?

Ken Stubbs: Yes it's Ken.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah I was actually on the nominating committee the year that you were appointed. You were appointed, not to be accountable to the council, but to be accountable to the Internet community.

I think the idea that you - the point that you made is well taken. And frankly if I had the ability to do it, what I would do would request that the non-com appointees on some sort of a regular basis.

Maybe it's twice a year or whatever it is, submit a brief summary of their participation and also recommendations as to how they feel they could be more effective in representing the ICANN community on the council.

But I think it's important to remember that you're accountability is not to the council. But rather to the ICANN community. And I think that's an easy way of doing it.

And maybe that's the suggestion that could come either from a non-com member or even - I don't necessarily think out of this committee.

With respect to the council members being required to report - to write reports, I don't think that's at all necessary. I think anybody who participates on the council, and I've been on the council for years. That is a significant work burden.

I think people that are selected to participate who are not council members should be - at least I would - I think there should be a lot of - I won't use the term pressure.

But let's say -say this discussion with constituencies, to ask the constituencies in the interest of transparency, that - to suggest these people not write a book. But just a brief summary of what their participation was.

And I don't think that's an unreasonable request to make of any constituency. You know, give the money to whoever you think should be - would be most effective for you.

But at the same point and time, at least ask them to provide a summary of how they participated. You know, they don't need to get into any real depth.

I mean somebody could write 500 words and, you know, you're not taking - that could be done on a plane on the way home from a meeting even. Just my thoughts.

Zahid Jamil: Can I? This (Zheid) in the queue.

Olga Cavalli: Yes (Zheid)? Is it you (Zheid)?

Zahid Jamil: Yes. That's (Zheid).

Olga Cavalli: Anyone else in the queue? Okay go ahead (Zheid).

Zahid Jamil: I think your point Ken, and I think it's more clear to me now. What you're basically saying is that council's already have their faithful, and the go to work burden. That's fine.

But non-councilors who basically - I think what you're trying - or I'd be my understanding is aggressive. Those individuals who may not have such a lot of work burden and are basically had attending the meeting.

And we don't want them to be just attending and not really giving any output of participation in the meetings. They should have some sense of the fact that they need to be contributing positively.

My question, and just at the moment is, what if you were going to - and this is in the restructured (unintelligible). Someone who's actually going to start working with this fund by one of their constituencies.

Would that - do you think - that says to me already also have some work burden on him or her. Would that also require in your view a report or a paragraph or one email?

Ken Stubbs: My (unintelligible) for you to say for yeah. Let's suppose I was Chairman of the left-handed Internet user working group. Somebody funded me to go to the ICANN meetings.

It's be very simple for me to provide a report back stating that I participated in the ICANN meeting as Chairman of the left-handed users working group. And I think that pretty well covers it. You know.

I don't think you have to go into a great depth as to what the working group accomplished or anything like that. Because that's documented in the ICANN Web site anyway.

All I'm asking is that you, you know, at least summarize exactly what you were doing at the ICANN meeting. You know.

Zahid Jamil: I understand that. Can I make a suggestion there? I think rather than say that that is a compulsory process that has to be applied.

Could we make a suggestion to the constituency that this is something that they could apply to individuals who are - who are not councilors, but are attending? Or, you know, things of that nature?

Ken Stubbs: Yeah. I don't have a problem with that at all. As a matter of fact, in my comments I did not use the word compulsory.

But rather I was - kind of how I put it - not necessarily applying pressure. But just strongly suggesting to constituencies that they provide that as some sort of transparency.

But that's only if addressing the constituency. The (IBC) may say we don't feel like we want to do it. But that's, you know, I think it's just a guideline - a suggested guideline. That's all.

Olga Cavalli: Anything else? Or comments in this regard? I have a question that I would like to rise into the group. After reading all the comments that weren't on the list, it seems to me - and correct me please if I'm wrong.

That there are some constituencies that wouldn't need funds for sending their representative to the meeting, as they are getting paid for their daily job. Which is related with the issues that are reviewed in the (unintelligible).

Did I understand it right? Did I understand it wrong? What's the feedback from you about this comment?

Tim Ruiz: This is (Tim). I'd like in the queue on that.

Olga Cavalli: (Tim). Who else?

Ken Stubbs: Ken Stubbs please.

Olga Cavalli: Ken. Who else? (Tim) go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: I don't recall that particular - put that particular way. What else in my view is - is that something about, you know, who's getting paid.

Or who's employers are, you know, whether their there for their employer or their volunteered on their own. This is about the constituency and representing the constituency.

So that at least in my view. So it's a question of whether the constituency can actually fund its participation within ICANN. So, that was the point that I've been trying to make.

And it is so, but what I suggest. And I think as (Zheid) was suggesting. Is that instead of getting into that whole issue, let's set that side.

And by allowing the constituency a certain amount of a fund, letting them decide how to allocate those funds. Getting into this question about, you know, who's getting paid or, you know.

If we look at individuals, that's where the problem come in in my view. And the (fudicial) council's going to be making decisions on which individuals get funds. I think that's where all the problems arise.

By putting this up on the constituencies, then that resolves that issue for the council.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Ken?

Ken Stubbs: You know, I mean, I'm in full support with (Tim) there. I'm probably the one that could be - I won't say personalize. But I'm - I'm not always comfortable with who gets the money.

But the more I think about it. The more I listen to arguments that have been made by people like (Robin) and so forth. The more I think it really belongs at the constituency level.

If a constituency wants to support people who have more than adequate resources to be able to attend these meetings, and who may or may not be compensated as part of the job description for participation. That's on the constituency.

But I honestly do not believe, and I feel it's very important for optics. If for any other reason. The council should not be in a position of having to approve who goes to the meeting.

It - the last tie around was perfect example. It gets too personalized. And I don't care what anybody says. I believe that there is a - I won't say - it's the appearance of conflict.

You know, that's how lawyers and accountants are used to dealing with the appearance of a conflict. And I think why not remove the appearance?

Fund the constituencies. Let the constituencies decide how to best use those funds.

And you send a message back to ICANN that says stop imposing all these (willy nilly) guidelines. Don't make it sound like it's a terrible burden on your accounting staff.

If we - if we approve someone for funding for a specific amount. Fund it. Don't give us - don't tell me you have to use your travel agency.

In my opinion, ICANN's one of the most inefficient users of travel. I used to be in that business. I owned a travel agency.

And I don't know how in the hell they come out with some of this stuff. You know. So, just keep it at the constituency level. And get - let ICANN get out of the way.

This was one of those cases where I'm a believer the government should just get out of the way.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Who else wants to comment on this (unintelligible)?

Zahid Jamil: (Zheid).

Olga Cavalli: (Zheid)? Okay go ahead.

Zahid Jamil: I completely agree with the comment that government should get out of the way. And I think more and more that I hear what's been said, we're sort of leaving this up to the constituency to decide.

I have no problems with having some language in there saying that this needs to be transparent. And needs to have some process as to how they're going to allocate. What sort of accountability are they going to have?

The concept that there should be accountability to the person attending should definitely be there. And we can simplify language.

I'm comfortable with the fact that non-compulsory - there are suggestions that the examples that's fine as well. I guess I'm repeating what I said earlier. But just wanted to chime in again. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think at this point, we are all agreeing is that (procedency) should allocate their funds in the way they decide. They should have some freedom and flexibility to do that. Do we agree on that?

(Robin Gross): Yes I think so.

Ken Stubbs: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: There is something else that I would like to write that I saw in the comments sent to the list. The idea of having kind of a committee for allocating this funds in-between the GNSO. This is at least what I understood. Any comments about this?

I personally, and this is my comment. I don't think that there should be a special committee within the council for this. I think the council has a lot of work to do. Which is not focused on this issue. And that's my opinion. But I would like to know yours.

Cyril Chua: Cyril Chua here. Can I come in?

Olga Cavalli: Who was that?

Cyril Chua: Cyril Chua.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Who else? (Sero) go ahead.

Cyril Chua: I don't think the council should be involved for the rate case. In particular, this tends to be a controversial issue. Let's just set the guidelines and roll out according to the guidelines and the rules.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you (Sero). Any other comments?

Ken Stubbs: Yeah. This is Ken Stubbs. I'd like to make a - what I would call a loose proposal for consideration for the next teleconference if I could Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Stubbs: All right. I'm going to divide the proposal into various steps. First of all, the amount budgeted. Let's not get into the quality of the amount. Because we'll never agree on that.

There are people who have definitive opinions as to how much should be budgeted. Let's assume that the ICANN Board budgets a specific amount of money for travel subsidies for a support organization.

First of all, that budget should be an annual number. The funds should be allocated to the constituencies for use on an annual basis.

That means the constituencies will have the responsibility for determining when in the annual scheme of things those funds could be spent most effectively for the constituencies.

If they run out for the last meeting, I'll look at them and say that's your problem. You know, you're big boys. If you want to spend all your money at one time and not have any at the end, that's your problem. Okay.

The next thing, the (names council). The only function that the council should have would be to act as a funnel to take the constituency designees and the amounts for a specific meeting, to whoever ICANN appoints as the person they coordinate that with.

The council should not be involved in making any decisions on that. As a matter of fact, I don't think council should decide how much each constituency gets.

I think it should be an arbitrary guideline that's determined at the very beginning and voted on by the council. If we decide all constituencies should get an equal basis. And if new constituencies are added, then they would just add it to the bottom half of the divisor.

But, I think that gives the constituencies the funds, the assurance the funds will be there. There's no politics involved at all there.

Then, as the next step. Would be once the funds are given to the constituency, accountability and transparency are imposed on the constituency. And I think we all know exactly what that means.

And, with respect to dealing with reports and so forth. I think we could add that at - later on. But I mean, this is a general set of guidelines that I think would be very easy to administer. Would keep the council optically out of the process.

And also, I think we'll, you know, there are two sides of this. You know, some people think they're getting too much. Other people think they're not getting enough.

It takes that argument out of the process entirely. That's an argument that needs to be made in a different venue as far as I'm concerned. Does that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: Oh very much. It was a very - very good summary of your ideas. I mostly agree with you. I kind of missed something when you were saying about the funds taken by constituencies.

Do you think that the whole funds - that it's designed for the GNSO be divided into constituencies? As an equal basis? That's the idea?

Ken Stubbs: Well, the only problem you run into. And maybe (Tim) or (Sero) or someone else might have a perspective on that. And that is the problem of - let's suppose that we enact a very important working group.

And I'll use an example the new (TLD) working group. That was an extremely important process.

If all the funds are allocated to constituencies, then what that means is constituencies are each going to have to decide whether or not they think it's important for them to use a portion of their funds to subsidize a working group leader in that case.

Because we all know (Bruce Conklin) did a hell of a lot of work on the new (TLD) process. I mean a huge amount of work.

And I would clearly vote to subsidize somebody who provides that kind of an effort if they feel that they need the funds.

So, you do have to deal with that issue. Because some people who may be proposed for subsidies, may - you may have a benefit to all the constituencies - the entire (SO).

And I don't know how to deal with that. I don't think that there should be a contingency budget. Because I've seen contingency budgets get blown just because somebody said, well we've got \$10,000 here at the

end of the year. Let's give everybody an initial \$1,000. Just so that they know, you know.

Spend it or lose it. I don't like that philosophy either. So that's something the council may have to deal with. Maybe some people have some suggestions on that?

Tim Ruiz: This is (Tim). I'd like to be in the queue on that.

Olga Cavalli: Anyone else want to comment?

(Robin Gross): This is (Robin). Can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (Tim), (Robin). Who else?

Zahid Jamil: (Zheid).

Olga Cavalli: Okay. (Tim), (Robin), (Zheid). (Tim) go ahead.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah I just wanted to - maybe - I guess we're going to need - clarifications are needed. Because if I understand (Tim) correctly. Going back to the new (GTO) meeting.

Some of the meetings that were held outside of the normal ICANN meetings, there was some travel funding separately provided for attendees.

So at that point can you? I mean, it does at my end answer - might solve your problem. And then that way these funds would be

earmarked specifically for ICANN meetings. Which is what the posted process to imply.

But I guess that's, you know, it's not the case if this -if these funds - all the funds were going to get, and I think that is an issue. And there should be some allowance for the constituencies to be able to say, well, we need to use some of these for these other - other meetings that are also important. Instead of all of it for ICANN use.

But I don't know if that's clear yet. Completely what these funds are intended for or what might be provided outside of them.

Ken Stubbs: Can you put me into the queue please. I can respond to (Tim) after everyone else has commented.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry. It was Ken? Okay (Robin) go ahead.

(Robin Gross): Thanks. Yeah I just wanted to just sort of summarize here. It sounds like we're deciding that we're going to leave it up to the constituencies to decide how to use the funds.

And so we're talking about there may be a particular dollar amount that will allocated. And so I guess we need to divide that up into the four stake holder groups.

I've been saying constituencies, but I guess as we switch, what I mean is stake holder groups. And so we leave it up to them to decide how to use it. And what kind of reporting mechanism to impose.

Although there must be some kind of accounting system or transparency as part of the process. And then there was this other issue that I wanted to raise. Just briefly.

And it was discussed a little bit on the list. And in some of the earlier conversations about this. And that's the issue of the level of class at which people travel.

I know some people want to be able to travel business class. And you know, wouldn't we all. But at the same time, I think we should leave it up to the constituencies to decide what level of class.

Because I know speaking for my constituency, if we had a certain dollar amount, we would prefer to send more people at a lower class, than fewer people at a higher class to travel.

So, we - I think we want to be able to have that kind of flexibility to make sure that we could use our funds to maximize the number of people that we can get to participate at a meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Robin). (Zheid)? (Zheid)? (Zheid)? I lost (Zheid)? Okay Ken?

Glen Desaintgery: He seems to be disconnected. I'll ask the operator to get him back.

Olga Cavalli: No problem. Ken?

Ken Stubbs: Yes. I'd like to respond to a couple of things. First of all to (Tim)'s comment. (Tim) in a case like that, what I'm talking about is that first of all when you have an essential working group.

I think it's in ICANN's best interest to fund special meetings for that working group. And I think that will continue. And I think if a community continues to apply pressure to ICANN, they will continue to do that.

Secondly, if you constitute a special working group. It may be in the council's prevue to apply enough pressure to ICANN to get ICANN to agree.

That because this is an essential working group to the ICANN process, they're willing to allocate specific funds to be used for working groups like this. Aside from the constituency travel things.

That's just food for thought for the council on how they could deal with it politically.

With respect to comment that (Robin) made, I think - I understand her concern. The only thing I would say is this. From a community standpoint, you get a significant amount of resentment if certain constituencies adopt a policy that implies that they - their - using the funds for first class or business travel like, when the other constituencies are doing the other way.

It just - optically, it's not a very good think to do. And I frankly don't care whether you're used to travelling business class or not used to travelling business class.

I think first of all, if you have medical issues. That's something entirely different. But if you just think that, you know, anytime you'd fly more

than five hours you ought to have - be sitting in the \$10,000 seat versus the guy who's sitting in a \$1,000 seat.

I would caution people. I think optically that sends a very bad signal out. And if we're going to look for funding from ICANN in the future, if they're requiring that their staff travel at a specific level, they're going to be much more conducive to funding travel if they do not appear to - if it does not appear to be just discriminatory.

I understand people's feelings on that. I've listened to (Avery) and so forth. And I know exactly how she feels. And I would say very simply - optically I just think that it's a very bad policy to follow.

And if was working at ICANN and somebody came to me with an additional budget deal like that, I'd be talking it down pretty badly. And say why the hell should they be able to fly business class, and we have to fly, you know, economy. That's just my two cents.

(Robin Gross): This is (Robin). I'm sorry.

Tim Ruiz: This is (Tim). Can I make a comment in there too?

(Robin Gross): Sure that we had the option of flying economy.

Olga Cavalli: This is (Robin)? (Robin) you want to talk?

(Robin Gross): Can you hear me okay/

Olga Cavalli: Oh yes. Now yes.

(Robin Gross): Yeah. Sorry about that. I just wanted to make sure that we have the option of being able to fly economy. That we wouldn't have to spend all of the funds on business class tickets.

That's - I'm not sure I got that - I conveyed that accurately. But that was the point that - we want to be able to use the funds for economy travel.

Olga Cavalli: (Tim)? You want to comment?

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. Just a couple questions I guess - maybe feel premature to get into this kind of detail. But, one is that, you know, that there would be an option - and I agree completely with Ken. And I understand (Robin).

I completely - but if - and it seems to me, and I'm not sure about this. But it seems the way it works right now. If someone did receive funding for travel, but they wanted to travel business - the rest of the business portion at their own cost.

Or at the cost of the constituency or whatever. That that's pretty difficult to do. And I didn't know if that was something that we wanted to consider allowing it or not.

In other words, they'd only be reimbursed for the coach class portion of it. But if they so chose by the constituency, whatever, they could divvy up the rest to travel business.

And then the other - the other issue is with the Chair being funded for business class. Just given that we're thinking about allowing the constituencies to allocate the funds.

You know, if the Chair is actually a counselor elected by one of the constituencies, then I guess I would question whether the Chair should automatically get funding and as well, get it at business class level.

That instead that then should fall back to the constituencies to decide. Unless the Chair is an NCA. Then that would be different. The NCA's are funded.

But even then I'd question the logic of funding the Chair even if they're an NCA at business class level. And why that would be the case versus others who might be funded to attend.

I guess I didn't understand that. So I'd like to through those questions out there. Whether we can discuss them in detail now or not. But I think those are things that we - should be addressed in this.

Ken Stubbs: Olga? Can I respond?

Olga Cavalli: Sure Ken. Go ahead.

Ken Stubbs: Yeah. And I'm going to - I'm unfortunately going to have to drop off the call after this. Two things. First of all, I don't have a problem at all, and I don't think that that's frankly ICANN's - within their (per via). I think it's how again, this is too much government.

As - you can get from point A to point B in economy class for \$1,000, and you can provide documentation that that's the cost of the economy ticket. And if you want to use miles to upgrade, or if you decide you want to pay it out of your own pocket - more power to you.

All you're going to get's \$1,000. Simple as that. And that's something that needs to be done within the constituency again. Of course you've got the transparency and so forth.

With respect to the Chair of the council. I believe that the funding for travel for the Chair of the council is treated by ICANN similarly to the Nominating Committee appointees as well.

It does not come out of the budget for the constituency. I may be wrong. I mean for the (SO). And I think that we should encourage ICANN to continue to fund the Chair of the (SO) independently like they do Nominating Committees.

And I do believe having been a Chair, that that is a level - that's an appropriate level for the Chair. No matter how much your job description calls for participation, believe me, being the Chair is about and beyond the call. And I think you'd have no trouble at all getting ICANN to agree with that in the future.

Also one other thing. I did notice that Doug's email to - on his elaboration email. He specifically mentions that the funding can be used for a full budget year. So it isn't per meeting. And that makes it easy for us to slide a recommendation like we've discussed into those guidelines without any issues.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Ken. We have come to our 1 hour and 10 minutes. And I would like to share with you some ideas of how to proceed. And I have some. Perhaps you can start, or I can bring mine.

I think that we could start back in the very very last document with all these ideas that we have been talking about. I think we made a good - good progress with regards to some things that we do agree.

We do agree that the role of the constituencies in relating with the funds. We do agree in flexibility. I think we do agree in the flexibility that constituencies should have in relation with these funds.

We have the issue or the question about having a contingency fund perhaps or not, which we could discuss further about that. What else? I think Ken made a very good summary. I make some notes.

How should we proceed from now on? I could perhaps draft a first starting document. And then you could add some other thoughts that I - maybe could think that could be relevant.

How? I want to ask you how do you want to proceed from now?

Zahid Jamil: Can I make a suggestion?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. It's (Zheid)?

Zahid Jamil: Yeah this is (Zheid), sorry. Can I make a suggestion? Ken had made a very good summary of how we see sort of - and since he's an accountant. How he sees the role over us like the annual funding aspect.

And I'd be very happy to have him draft up a paragraph - draft, so he can help you. And maybe somebody else can draft up other paragraph.

Maybe that's one way to do it. Where everybody takes upon a certain aspect. Or you can come up with the draft and we can just add in comments.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Zheid). I think it's a great idea. Ken you made a very interesting summary maybe 20 minutes ago. I take some notes. And maybe I can check the recording.

But perhaps you could send us two or three paragraphs with this information. And I like the suggestion made by (Zheid).

Perhaps you can send me and I can make some other parts of the document. And I can - (Zheid) do you think Ken is making the drafting document - the draft of the document? Or I should be putting all together? What every you say is better.

Zahid Jamil: I just thought that he made a very good point about - and Ken can sort of comment and verify. Sort of volunteering him for this may not be appropriate.

But, I'm just saying that (unintelligible) about the annual budget. And if he's sill online, maybe he give us a paragraph of that. Rather than get him to do all the work there.

Maybe somebody else can talk about accountability and letting constituencies decide their own - the (unintelligible) funds. And the flexibility can - I don't know (unintelligible).

Why don't we ask people around - on this call if they're happy to participate in giving a paragraph on each issue if they want to pick up an issue.

Or alternatively, if (unintelligible) to do so, and (unintelligible). And then we can all send in our comments to it.

Olga Cavalli: Any comment? Ken?

Glen Desaintgery: Olga this is Glen. Ken has dropped of the line.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we lost Ken. We don't know if he can send the paragraph. But we can contact him by email. I think he should be able to send this - this paragraph.

So, I volunteer for putting all these ideas in a document. But it would be very much helpful for me if you could send some ideas. I have make some notes during our call. And I will make mine.

And we can share then along the list. And we could perhaps start drafting this source document that I volunteered to write with your input.

And I will ask the same to Ken over the list and by email. What do you think? Do you agree with this idea? No comments?

Zahid Jamil: Yes.

Tim Ruiz: I agree.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Glen? We should be meeting next week perhaps?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes if you would like to. I will organize a call at the same time. Is that all right?

Olga Cavalli: For me it could be more convenient if it would be a little bit later. Because I have some practice at the university. And it overlaps somehow with this classes. But if the group wants to keep this time, it's okay. I can fix that.

Glen Desaintgery: I'll send out a note to the group Olga if you think it would be good asking them if we could shift it to one hour later.

Olga Cavalli: One hour? Yeah. One hour later would be perfect. If not, half an hour later would be fine.

Glen Desaintgery: Is everybody on the call agreeable to this?

((Crosstalk))

Greg Ruth: I'll be unable to be on - this is (Greg Ruth). I'll be unable to be on the call. On Wednesday I'll be in the air most of the day. But that's okay. You can go on without me if everybody else agrees this is the best time.

Olga Cavalli: Maybe we could change it Thursday if you want. Because this Thursday we had the council conference call. But next Thursday we won't. At least, I will not have any other calls.

(Robin Gross): That's fine.

Greg Ruth: Can I just ask for clarification? Are we suggesting the 22nd?

Glen Desaintgery: The 23rd.

Greg Ruth: 23rd?

Glen Desaintgery: The 22nd would be a Wednesday and the 23rd is a Thursday.

Greg Ruth: I see. 23rd I might be travelling - supposed to be travelling. I might seem very happy with 24th. And I believe somebody else may be travelling on the 23rd also. No?

Olga Cavalli: For me it's okay. The only concern I have is our deadline for finishing. Which is our deadline?

Glen Desaintgery: The 25th of November.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think it's okay. Friday?

Glen Desaintgery: Friday? At what time?

Olga Cavalli: At this time is okay.

Glen Desaintgery: Well there is another call on Friday that might overlap with this a bit. And that is a (Fast Flux Group).

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: So I think probably we.

Olga Cavalli: Would you perhaps make it a (doodle)?

Glen Desaintgery: I'll (doodle) okay?

Olga Cavalli: So and if you could add this - another new time for Wednesday that could perhaps be a little bit more my way.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay. I'll do that.

Olga Cavalli: My schedule. So we have - I will receive your paragraphs - your comments. I will do mine after the notes I've been taking in the call.

And I put them all together in a document and I will send it to you after a date that I've been receiving them.

And we can share some of the comments on the list. And we meet again in the date that we agree through the (doodle). Okay? Are we okay?

Greg Ruth: All right.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you everybody.

Greg Ruth: Thank you.

(Robin Gross): Thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: No, thank you to you and we keep in touch over the list. And we talk in a few days. Bye-bye.

Greg Ruth: All right. Bye-bye.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Glen for your help.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye.

Greg Ruth: Goodbye Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: Bye-bye. Thank you.

Zahid Jamil: Bye Glen. Thank you. Bye.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you.

END